

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Due to a misunderstanding, the Applicant's attorney submitted an amendment without receiving approval from the Applicant. This supplemental response seeks to effect the amendments intended by the Applicant. Accordingly, independent claims 13, 33, 34 and 51 have been further amended, as the Applicant intended, to more clearly define the various embodiments of the present invention.

Claims 1-11, 13-22, 24, 28-41 and 51 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Wingate. Claims 12, 23 and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wingate. Claims 25-27 and 43-50 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wingate in view of the Applicant's admitted prior art.

Applicant expresses his appreciation to Examiner Donald M. Lair and SPE Nancy Le for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to Applicants' representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held in the USPTO on January 6, 2004.

In the interview, claims 1-51 were discussed vis-à-vis the prior art reference Wingate (U.S. 4,480,312). The Interview Summary Record states, in relevant part, "The differences between Wingate (U.S. 4,480,312) and the present invention were discussed, primarily the fact that the variable frequency signal generated by Wingate is input to a microprocessor input, while the variable frequency signal of the present invention is input to the clock signal input of the microprocessor. It was agreed that an amendment containing clarification of this arrangement would be entered and considered by the Examiner."

Applicant has previously amended claim 1 to recite “a microprocessor having a clock input” and “to supply said pulse signal to said clock input of said microprocessor”.

Applicant has amended claim 13 to recite “a microprocessor having a clock input” and “a clock oscillator circuit connected to said clock input”.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite “a microprocessor operative to receive a signal having a varying amplitude from a sensor, said signal being provided as an input to a clock circuit connected to a clock input of said microprocessor.”

Applicant has amended claim 34 to recite “a microprocessor having a clock input” and “a clock oscillator circuit connected to said clock input and generating a clock signal for said microprocessor”.

Claim 51 has been amended to recite “an oscillator circuit operable to generate a clock signal for a microprocessor” and “said microprocessor is operable to process the clock signal and to determine parameters of said first signal by measuring variations in the frequency of said clock signal.”

Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in Fig. 7A and Fig. 9 and in the specification on page 26, lines 1-4 and page 27, lines 22-24.

As discussed in the interview, Wingate discloses an electronic temperature sensor/controller system generating a variable frequency signal and providing the variable frequency signal as input to a regular microprocessor input (I/O). Wingate does not show or suggest providing the variable frequency signal as input to a clock input or to a clock circuit of the microprocessor, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 13, 33, 34 and 51.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13, 33, 34 and 51 are deemed to be allowable. All of the remaining claims each depend directly or ultimately from one of these independent claims and recite additional patentable matter, and are therefore deemed allowable. Thus, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

Applicant has carefully studied the remaining prior art of record herein and concludes that the invention as described and claimed in the present application is neither shown in nor suggested by the cited art.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Stefan J. Klauber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 22,604

KLAUBER & JACKSON
411 Hackensack Avenue
Hackensack, NJ 07601

Date: 2/20/04